

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LORENA MARTIN et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WE ENFORCE JUDGMENTS, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:25-cv-03285-SB-AS

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Plaintiffs Lorena Martin, Estela Martin, Juan Martin, Jr., and Juan Martin, Sr. filed this action on April 15, 2025. After Plaintiffs failed to timely serve Defendant within the 90-day deadline under Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court ordered them to show cause, by July 24, why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. Dkt. No. 9. In its order to show cause (OSC), the Court warned that failure to timely respond “will be construed as consent to dismissal without prejudice of Plaintiffs’ claims.” *Id.*

Under Rule 4(m), “[i]f a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court—on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). Plaintiffs have not shown good cause or provided any reason to extend the 90-day deadline. Instead, they have failed to timely respond to the OSC or to file a proof of service.

Accordingly, the Court dismisses this action in its entirety without prejudice. A final judgment will be issued separately.

Date: July 29, 2025



Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr.
United States District Judge